Berghahn Books

History of the Manchester 'School' and the Extended-Case Method
Author(s): Marian Kempny
Source: *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Social and Cultural Practice*, Vol. 49, No. 3, THE MANCHESTER SCHOOL: PRACTICE AND ETHNOGRAPHIC PRAXIS IN ANTHROPOLOGY (Winter 2005), pp. 144-165
Published by: Berghahn Books
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/23179079
Accessed: 14/06/2014 02:44

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Berghahn Books is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Social and Cultural Practice.*

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

HISTORY OF THE MANCHESTER 'SCHOOL' AND THE EXTENDED-CASE METHOD

Marian Kempny

Abstract: This article examines the question of whether the notion of the 'Manchester School' functions as a description of a separate type of anthropological practice. Basic historical aspects of this school's tradition are scrutinized. These are as follows: its Africanist roots, its Oxford lineage, the personal leadership of Max Gluckman, and the Manchester seminar, renowned as a hotbed of innovation in social anthropology. Elucidating the significance of the extended-case method as theoretically laden, the article seeks to clarify what could turn Mancunian anthropology into a scientific 'school' in the strict sense of the term.

Keywords: extended-case method, Mancunian, Oxford, Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, scientific school, seminar

Manchester Anthropology and Different Meanings of the 'Research School'

Despite the fact that the Manchester School in many respects belongs now to the history of anthropology, its legacy still attracts a lot of attention. However, in order to get a fresh insight into the nature and foundations of this approach that once evolved around the Department of Social Anthropology and Sociology of the Victoria University of Manchester, some further historical and theoretical inquiries are necessary. There have been several vast areas of dispute about this tradition, out of which I take up one that I believe to be both important and often misinterpreted. To my mind, there is a question as to what extent the term 'school' is an adequate description of the phenomenon being discussed. Numerous and recurrent references made by the historians of anthropology to 'Manchester School' seem to rule out any skepticism about its existence.[1] At the same time, Clyde Mitchell, a person counted among the most prominent members of the school, in a personal communication surprisingly enough declared:

Social Analysis, Volume 49, Issue 3, Winter 2005, 144–165 © *Berghahn Journals*

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

"Seen from the outside, the Manchester School *was* a school. But seen from the inside, it was a seething contradiction. And perhaps the only thing we had in common was that Max [Gluckman] was our teacher, and that meant we wrote ethnography rich in actual cases" (quoted in Werbner [1984] 1990: 152–153).

Moreover, in the title of a recently rediscovered manuscript authored by Gluckman and written as a part of his application for research funds—"The History of the Manchester 'School' of Social Anthropology and Sociology"—Gluckman himself, the unquestionable founder of this tradition, put the word 'school' in quotation marks.[2] This raises the question as to whether the term 'Manchester School' was chosen by people, based in that department, who constituted this tradition or was rather a label imposed from outside. It has also to do with suggestions that perhaps in the case of the history of social anthropology, a less theoretically laden description—such as the term 'Manchester anthropology'—might be more suitable. Nonetheless, in Gluckman's above-mentioned document, one can also find, quoted with approval, the earliest recognition that a new school in anthropology had emerged, which appeared in a review by Mary Douglas of William Watson's (1958) book, *Tribal Cohesion in a Money Economy*.

Douglas (1959: 168) states in her review: "From the many and illuminating references to the researches of other Manchester and Rhodes-Livingstone anthropologists, whether they have worked in Central Africa or other fields, it is evidently time to salute a 'school' of anthropology, whose publications are developed through close discussion, and where each worker's work is enhanced by his focus on a common stock of problems." In the same document, Gluckman put special emphasis on the collective nature of the Central African research and the distinctive and significant character of the school. Additionally, in order to underline the fact that the school had already become known internationally, thanks to "the quality of its work," Gluckman refers to the appreciation given to him in the French academia by stating: "[W]hen lecturing at the Sorbonne I was introduced as leader of *l'Ecole de Manchester* by Professor Georges Balandier, who also wrote in an article on 'Structures sociales traditionelles et changements economiques' in *Cahiers D'Etudes Africaines* (1960: 2), when discussing the importance of a dynamic approach to the problems of changing Africa: 'C'est un point du vue qu'ont également choisi les anthropologues anglais de l'Ecole de Manchester'" (Gluckman n.d.).

Clearly, it was not only for administrative purposes that Gluckman pointed out in his communication several basic features of the school. Among them, the most crucial one seems to be that about teamwork in accordance with a firmly coordinated plan. Yet it is also a similar methodology worked out while attacking common problems of the study of change in the tribal situations that Gluckman (n.d.) put forward when describing the school's uniqueness: "I think the main characteristics of our school developed out of a combination of working out comparable techniques for detailed studies of tribes, presenting series of incidents affecting the same groups of persons within a social morphological framework, validated by sophisticated numerical and statistical analyses (inspired by Barnes, Colson and Mitchell)."

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

It is easy to recognize in this statement a sketchy description of the extended-case method, which was to become a trademark of Mancunian anthropology. This methodology has produced many excellent and original studies, as well as having had an impact on the way of doing ethnography in non-Manchester-trained circles. As a result, one can argue that even today leading contemporary anthropologists in America, who were trained in Britain, demonstrate noticeably Mancunian characteristics in their approach.[3] Still, the adoption of this particular methodology did not necessarily produce substantive ideas, nor was there always satisfaction with its approach. In fact, the key problem is that except for the concern with social process, conflict, and change, no unified body of theory can be attributed exclusively to the Manchester tradition.[4]

In brief, whereas the Manchester anthropology is recognized as a school even far beyond its provenance, it is far from clear which theoretical innovations, if any, seem to be typically Mancunian.[5] In addition, the purpose of the school is not well defined. As acknowledged by Richard P. Werbner, himself an Africanist, its scope from the very outset was broad and encompassed a wide range of studies of British and Indian villages, as well as tribal politics and peasant economies, including research in urban settings in Britain. However, the roots of the Manchester tradition can be traced to Max Gluckman's directorship of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute of Social Studies (RLI) in British Central Africa, where he was second director of the institute and attracted to it a spate of field researchers.[6] The field research in Africa seems still to be a vital factor that accounts for the strength of individual ties with and one's feelings of belonging to the Manchester School. In what follows, I will try to substantiate this claim and pinpoint other features on which specificity of this 'school' might rest. Of course, all this initially requires some thoughts about the meaning of the very concept of 'school' in the social sciences.

In order to avoid the danger of using this term in a trite and purely persuasive way, I will attempt to clarify its basic meanings. Following Jerzy Szacki (1975), one can distinguish between scientific or intellectual 'schools' in an institutional sense, in a psychological sense, and in a typological sense. These different understandings also indicate separate ways of articulating the issue in question. First, let us consider the Manchester School from an institutional point of view, which means that the interests, concepts, and concerns unique for a certain group of scholars are perceived as produced and sustained within the same institutional framework.

Seen from such a perspective, the Manchester School was in fact nested in two different, though very closely entangled, institutions: the RLI (later renamed the Institute for Social Research of the University of Zambia) and the Department of Social Anthropology and Sociology of the Victoria University of Manchester. These institutions and their personnel constituted a material base for an intellectual tradition still proudly referred to by many as the 'Manchester School'. In this context, one can look at the Manchester School as a far-flung network of scholars and researchers that encompasses several generations and undoubtedly is a unique phenomenon in the history of British anthropology.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

At the same time, I would fully agree with Lyn Schumaker (2001: 4), the author of a recent monograph of the school entitled *Africanizing Anthropology. Fieldwork, Network, and the Making of Cultural Knowledge in Central Africa*, that when writing the history of anthropology, a focus on the social and cultural factors in the particular historical situation of the Manchester School is as important as its intellectual genealogies and connections. However, while endorsing her claim about the importance of social and cultural contexts, which calls attention to the role played by the colonial culture and by missionary and administrative practices in shaping the work of anthropologists in Africa, I take another tack and deal with the foundational myths of the Manchester School as an anthropological research school.

To my mind, the significance of Manchester as a "first-class research school" (Gluckman n.d.) is beyond any doubt, but it goes beyond the Central African research. Advanced training and studying in Manchester meant for students something more than pure apprenticeship that made them specialists in African anthropology. It had to do with shaping the feelings of solidarity focused around Gluckman as well as with developing craftsmanship in anthropological research (or social research).[7]

By juxtaposing the focus on the Manchester School as a broader intellectual category and the history of RLI as a more local, African-centered phenomenon, one can see the constitutive factors for this school being regarded as a frame of individual identifications and thereby gain psychological insight into the Manchester School. The intellectual school in such an understanding might be based on a different principle than belonging to a more-or-less centered network of colleagues involved in direct and intense interpersonal relations and focused around a certain point source, i.e., an intellectual leader. Such a principle, which might constitute a school in science corresponding to the idea of solidarity without propinquity, can be most adequately expressed in terms of the reference group model (cf. Szacki 1975: 175). In this case, belonging to a particular 'school' is determined not by immersion in a particular institutional and personal setting but by adherence to a defined set of ideas about research procedures or to a conceptual or theoretical framework treated as reference points in any research activities.

To grasp the features that can help unravel the specificity of Manchester anthropology, tracing the commonalities by means of which researchers who have never worked together, or never even met, attack and theorize research problems is as important as investigating the Manchester School's legends and anecdotes by means of which its members have been able to construct their own identities. Such a view on the nature of the school in science also draws our attention to the third sense of the meaning indicated above. The so-called typological approach indicates that the term 'school' might be applicable to a group of scientists singled out because of the common traits discovered in their methodology or theory, even when they have never identified themselves with this particular group. It is worthwhile to consider whether the term 'Manchester School' might function also as an entirely analytical description of a separate type of anthropological practice.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Within the confines of this essay, I can examine only some basic aspects of the Manchester School in the quest to determine its identity. These include its African origin, its Oxford connection, the charismatic leadership of Max Gluckman, and the Manchester seminar, which generated innovations in anthropological methods. By scrutinizing these factors, I hope to clarify what made this tradition, regarded as a major force in British social anthropology in the 1950s and 1960s (cf., e.g., Kuper 1983: 128), a 'school'.

The African Roots of the Manchester School

The history of the school begins with Max Gluckman's post-graduate training, when he took over as director of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute in British Central Africa in Livingstone (then Northern Rhodesia). Founded in 1937, the RLI was the first social science research institute in Africa, and from 1941, under Gluckman's directorship, it operated as an anthropological field research center. Its appointed team of research workers were involved in the study of neighboring areas of Central Africa in accordance with a coordinated plan drafted by Gluckman himself.[8]

From the very outset, Gluckman worked closely at the RLI with Barnes, Colson, and Clyde Mitchell in order to give them basic field training. In addition, Barnes and Mitchell got instruction from Isaac Schapera at Cape Town. Together with Gluckman, they also did two field surveys as their main post-graduate training, which resulted in the writing up by Mitchell and Barnes (1950) of a report of one of these surveys. During this period, the reciprocal visits to the field sites and the RLI-based conferences at its first headquarters stimulated within the circle of trainees, teachers, and colleagues an intellectual exchange that facilitated standardization of research practices. The first of these conferences, which took place in 1947, served to coordinate the researchers' projects and the ways of reporting on their respective fieldwork. Each researcher gave a presentation to the seminar that needed a systematization of data at an early stage and faced a critique from Gluckman and the other participants. As Mitchell recalled it: "Field methods were the most important focus of the seminars—crucial—and this built us into a team, with all having a similar approach. Max Gluckman emphasized concrete documentation and kept quoting Malinowski to us" (quoted in Schumaker 2001: 107). In addition, the gathering of comparable data made the RLI a storehouse of field notes, which could be consulted and commented on by other researchers. One can also claim that an important additional factor, which influenced the coherence of the team and drew its members together, was the publication of some of the early work of Gluckman's students, including contributions to the *Rhodes-Livingstone Institute Journal* and a notable edited collection, *Seven Tribes of British Central Africa* (Colson and Gluckman 1951).

The function of such integrative activities in the development of the Manchester School became even more visible as Gluckman made growing use of the seminars and publications to further develop the approach while

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

at Oxford and, finally, during his period at Manchester. Gluckman moved to Oxford in 1947, but it was in 1949, when he became the chair of social anthropology at the University of Manchester and when the Department of Social Anthropology and Sociology was set up, that he started to develop the institutional foundations of the school. Its core principle consisted of a close collaboration between the Manchester Department and the RLI. The mechanism that linked these institutions together is plainly described in Gluckman's (n.d.) document:

> [W]hen I moved to found a Department of Social Anthropology at Manchester, she [Colson—the subsequent director] had all her Research Officers come to me for advanced training and to do their Ph.D. degrees. After preliminary training at Manchester, they went to Central Africa, returned to Manchester, went again to Central Africa, and then back to Manchester. This policy was continued by Mitchell, who succeeded Colson, when owing to temporary ill-health she had to leave the tropics and became first a Simon Fellow, and then Senior Lecturer, at Manchester. In this way Turner, A. L. Epstein, van Velsen, Watson and Gann (an historian), all did their main preparation and writing-up at Manchester, though of course they were supervised in the field by Colson and Mitchell who organized conferences at which they were also taught.

As a matter of fact, due to the strong ties of the RLI with the metropolitan university and with founding organizations supporting it (especially the Simon Research Fund), Gluckman was able to bring the RLI directors (Colson and Mitchell) for longer periods to Manchester, to send Barnes to do fieldwork in Norway, to appoint as fellows and visiting professors many outstanding workers (Ian Cunnison, A.L. (Bill) Epstein, Max Marwick, Victor Turner, and William Watson), and to have their books published. The whole group produced out of their research a well-coordinated stream of publications.[9] In this context, it is worth expanding on the role of the Central African research, which remained for a long time the core of the Manchester departmental research program and which has been recognized as one of the most significant programs of research in the history of social anthropology. While building up the department, Gluckman considered that in order to develop a research school, a common focus would be needed and, in a natural way, opted for Central Africa. He not only opened the career path for the RLI anthropologists who later obtained posts in Manchester but also encouraged his Manchester students who were interested in Africa to take jobs in the RLI.[10]

To sum up, Gluckman provided at Manchester the solid foundations for the training of and the writing up of results for successive groups of RLI fieldworkers, as well as the established interconnections necessary to construct a unified body of theory and method, all of which fully deserves the name of Manchester School. It allows returning to my initial question: What made the Manchester anthropology a 'school'? If the emphasis is put on field research methods based on some basic procedures as its *differentia specifica*,[11] one nonetheless must note that from the moment he set up the department at Manchester, Gluckman can be said to have paid greater attention to theory.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

I discuss this claim in more detail later on, but it is doubtful whether even during its early period the Manchester group was a school in a strongly typological sense, which implies adherence to a body of theory. Whereas Mitchell denies the theoretical focus of the RLI seminars (cf. Schumaker 2001: 108–109), Fred Bailey, a member of the first generation of Mancunians, recalls that theory did not form the major topics of discussion during the departmental seminars at Manchester in the early 1950s (Wenner-Gren 2003 interview). There is no doubt, though, that at Manchester Gluckman used the reanalysis of renowned ethnographies—and also those produced under the RLI approach—as a teaching technique wherein the same data were analyzed from a number of different perspectives to check the usefulness of specific theories. In other words, the Manchester seminars became the testing ground for innovations born in the field.

In trying to identify the relationship between Manchester and the RLI, it seems that although Gluckman's move to Manchester finally fostered theoretical inclinations among members of the group, Lyn Schumaker (2001: 151) is right in holding that "this research school's emergence and group character had already evolved in the field." Many of Gluckman's initiatives during this period confirm that, as he told Mitchell in 1949, he intended to "build a new RLI" at Manchester. This is the main reason why he sought to retain the association of the RLI people with the department.

The Oxford Lineage of Manchester

It is the RLI activities that provide the background against which an adequate description of the Manchester School's development becomes possible. The best illustration of the thesis that the RLI experience actually begot the Manchester anthropology is the Oxford lineage of the school. Gluckman himself was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, where he obtained his PhD in 1936, and Barnes, Mitchell, and Ian Cunnison likewise earned doctorates from Oxford between 1950 and 1952. At the same time, Manchester was established clearly as an alternative to the structural approach typical of Oxford anthropology.[12] Paradoxically, the alternative became apparent when Gluckman took a lectureship at Oxford in October 1947, bringing with him Barnes, Colson, and Mitchell. The group had developed close cooperation during research in Africa, though settled many miles apart in the field, and this process of evolving a tight-knit working group continued when they moved to Oxford. They ran biweekly Rhodes-Livingstone seminars on their own, working over theoretical problems and research techniques, with Gluckman teaching Cunnison (then newly appointed to the RLI) and other post-graduate students. Two of them—Mary Douglas and John Middleton—were later regarded as crucial members of the Oxford structural school.

Although Gluckman officially acknowledged the merits of teachings that his students received at that time from E. E. Evans-Pritchard and Meyer Fortes at Oxford, it seems that he rather believed that they had been properly trained at the RLI and as a group were able to compete with already established

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

anthropological schools.[13] In addition, this period in Oxford resulted in the construction of the above-mentioned collection, *Seven Tribes in British Central Africa,* with articles written by Gluckman, Colson, Barnes, and Mitchell based on their recent fieldwork and on seminar presentations given at the Institute of Social Anthropology at Oxford. All this raises the question as to what this period meant for the RLI team, who were establishing their identities as part of the Oxford structuralist tradition dominated by Evans-Pritchard's scholarship (cf. also Werbner [1984] 1990).

Gluckman himself was doubtless greatly influenced by Evans-Pritchard and showed an attitude of respect toward Oxford, but in the first generation of his trainees, the feelings of dissatisfaction with the structural functionalism of Cambridge and Oxford and with Radcliffe-Brown were easily noticeable and widespread.[14] For this reason, it is much more convincing to interpret the Oxford period as a formative experience for the development of a separate RLI identity quickly transformed into a Mancunian one than to look at the Manchester School as an outgrowth of Oxford structural functionalism. In effect, the Manchester School came to the fore as a team deeply rooted in Central African research—a tight-knit group that maintained its separate identity in the face of the prestige of the Oxford and Cambridge traditions.

The Department of Social Anthropology and Sociology at Manchester

Although this problem is well studied, the answers given to the need of describing the Manchester School's inception and of periodizing the developments in the department are not entirely unanimous. In a clear way, when Manchester's Department of Social Anthropology was set up in 1949, two meanings of the scientific school identified above—the institutional and the psychological—evidently resonated as almost conterminous. The Oxford seminars strengthened the ties among the scholars who shared common experiences of field research and constituted a nucleus of the prospective school. A very strong case supporting such a view is made by Schumaker (2001: 37ff.), who argues convincingly that in terms of the genealogy of the school, it was exactly the shared involvement in fieldwork of the first group of RLI people who transferred to Oxford and finally to Manchester that created a foundational group experience, which was subsequently enhanced when the team presented themselves as a whole to academia and to the wider public.[15] However, very soon the new Manchester Department started to recruit a new group of novices who came not only from African field research sites.

As I see it, then, the institutional growth of the department shows that explanations given by Vincent (1990), who describes the beginnings of the Manchester School by tracing out its Oxford theoretical ancestry, and by Schumaker (2001: 37–38), who introduces a category of "field generation" in order to describe the formative stages of the school, are not fully compelling. In fact, at the beginning the situation was different—both more complex and more banal.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

There is no doubt about the RLI roots of the school. Even in the early 1960s, Gluckman intended to continue with Central African anthropology as a core of the departmental research and expand it further. From his document on the history of the department (Gluckman n.d.), one can learn that he planned to develop "socio-anthropological studies" in Tanganyika and Kenya. In this connection, he tried to appoint to a post in the department Martin Southwold, an East Africanist working in Sudan, and wanted to send "at least occasional students" to West Africa.[16]

Nevertheless, from the very outset he also accepted into the department students and researchers who had no interest in Africa or had been educated in different disciplines, especially those trained in sociology. After World War II, there were also social circumstances that pushed some categories of people to seek a university education. In fact, it is not easy in retrospect to determine the decisive factor that attracted research students to the department. As Bailey (Wenner-Gren 2003 interview) recalls: "Max provided us with jobs. Max had a new department; Max had money, at least in small quantities. Of course most of us, except Frankenberg, were ex-soldiers and eligible for further-education grants ... I don't think that there was a system of recruitment [to the department]."

In fact, the expansion of the tight-knit group into the bidisciplinary department over time altered the situation of full cohesion within the school. The dividing lines seem to go along three main criteria. The most obvious was the generational difference, but, as suggested above, no less important was the fact of different regional interests. Last but not least was the closeness of Gluckman's disciples to his theoretical concerns and methodological views. The concurrence among these criteria would suggest that as far as the Manchester School is concerned, the three senses of the intellectual school previously distinguished have coincided. Actually, their full concurrence came about only at the very early stages, and it is the very process of the gradual dispersion of the school that Werbner ([1984] 1990) expressed in the hypothesis about its evolution from a close-knit group to a loose-knit network linking widely dispersed scholars.

As Vincent (1990) observed, whereas the members of the first generation of student-collaborators of Gluckman (born in 1911) were born between 1918 (Barnes and Mitchell) and 1929 (Ronald Frankenberg), the members of the second generation were born between 1934 and 1940. The first age cohort included, in addition to the Central Africanists already mentioned, F. G. Bailey and T. S. Epstein (both doing their research in India), Abner Cohen, Emrys Peters, and Frankenberg. A full roll call of the second generation of Mancunians is more problematic. Vincent's (1990: 461) list includes the following names: M. J. Aronoff, G. K. Garbett, N. E. Long, E. E. Marx, S. Deshen, J. M. Pettigrew, B. Sansom, M. Shokeid, J. Singh Uberoi, R. P. Werbner. But this list does not seem complete without such names as D. M. Boswell, T. M. S. Evens, D. Handelman, B. Kapferer, and P. Harries-Jones. Werbner ([1984] 1990: 154) mentions, in turn, a third generation consisting of Manchester students of the school's early members, most of whom did not do their fieldwork in Africa. Notable exceptions are the students of Clyde Mitchell who, being based at the

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland in Salisbury (Southern Rhodesia) until the mid-1960s, was able to adhere to the research tradition of the RLI by sending his pupils to the field in south-central Africa.

In general, the perspective suggested by an analysis of the Manchester School in terms of personal relationships between its members belonging to different generations discloses the significance of variation in regional interests that might weaken or strengthen the feelings of belonging to the network, with Gluckman as its point source.[17] At the same time, the focus on regional interests enables conceptualization of the idea of the school as a heterogeneous setting with core locations and more marginal ones. It allows distinguishing at Manchester, during the time of Gluckman's chairmanship, three categories of persons: the first was composed of the RLI old-timers and Central African students; the second was associated with the study of Israeli society and consisted of researchers from Israel, Canada, the United States, and Britain, who came to Manchester mainly in the 1960s; the third was made up of "the odd men, people on the fringe, or if you wish to put it in this way people on the margins" (Bailey, personal communication).[18] Obviously, these three sets of people have not always been internally homogeneous. For example, Abner Cohen, a Jewish member of the school in its early days, who did not belong to the 'Israeli contingent' involved in the Bernstein project, came to work with Emrys Peters, who was himself studying Arabs in the Middle East.

It is worthwhile to emphasize that the conditions of marginality in the department were not so unproblematic as it might appear. One should also take into account the combination of the two disciplines within the department, which was reflected by the existence of a group of sociologists developing research on rural and urban life in Britain but also in general sociology.[19] Again, however, it turns out that Gluckman did not care about the labels—sociology or anthropology—as long as the research was done in accordance with the tradition that dominated the department. That is why R. J. Frankenberg, T. Lupton, Sheila Cunnison, V. Pons, D. Allcorn, and W. Watson, although appointed to sociological positions, were regarded as social anthropologists and their research as social anthropological in nature. As a result, an individual's marginality or more central location within the network could not depend solely on an incessant preference for African studies.[20]

Therefore, in order to take up the issue of marginality properly, it is necessary to deepen our understanding of Manchester anthropology as a school by introducing a typological sense of the term. It means that one should try to find out whether, in taking into account all of these various groups and marginal people, there are some features they share that mark them as typical of Manchester and distinct from those involved in other kinds of methodological or theoretical approaches. For instance, according to Bailey (Wenner-Gren 2003 interview), the minimal set of such features connected with the theoretical issues carried over from the RLI days boils down to several categories—conflict, process, and change—and to a slightly hostile attitude toward the study of culture as arrays of ideas divorced from actions in the world. Although the central motifs were those of conflict, opposition, social change, and social order, the works of Mancunians abounded in a conceptually brand-new vocabulary,

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

which includes the following categories (to list just a few among many more): the social field, inter-calary roles, situational selection, cross-cutting ties, dominant cleavage, redressive ritual, processual change, and processional form (see Werbner [1984] 1990: 152).

In more general theoretical terms, it implies the focus on the dynamics of social systems and the search for models that could account for continuity in and the collapse of social order. The concept of 'rituals of rebellion' is perhaps the most widely known example of Gluckman's explanation of dialectic between continuity and discontinuity and how the latter could contribute to social cohesion. Yet again, as Adam Kuper (1983: 148ff.) argues, the immediate inspiration for Gluckman's approach should be looked for in the work of the Oxford structural functionalists—Radcliffe-Brown and Evans-Pritchard. Nevertheless, even from this point of view, Mancunian theories illustrate a potential development of Oxford orthodoxy. Within the confines of this essay, I am unable to discuss the issue of how strongly Gluckman stuck to central tenets of structural functionalism;[21] however, undoubtedly in one respect this issue went far beyond the classical functional issues of system equilibrium in which Gluckman's and his followers' views on colonial societies were rooted. It was the relations of power and domination present in the white-ruled Central African societies that emerged in their studies, which for the first time provided an additional appropriate context of RLI activities and the Mancunian approach.

The early RLI scholars were fairly left-wing and sympathetic to the working-class,[22] but later the broad statement "We are all Maxists here" became a jibe that reflected a Marxist aroma hanging around Max Gluckman's department. In reality, the fact that they perceived their commitment to anthropology partly in political terms reflected mainly their anti-racist and anti-colonial attitudes. Consequently, many of the RLI workers had great difficulty getting into the field because of their political sympathies, and RLI scholars were treated with great suspicion by colonial authorities. Gluckman himself became a prohibited immigrant and was not to be allowed back to Barotseland until independence.[23] As a result, this group practiced anthropology with an awareness of the political ramifications of social situations in colonial societies and the ethical responsibility of anthropologists. It partly explains the anti-cultural, strongly sociological bias of Manchester-style research.

In light of the above, it is helpful once again to quote Bailey's (Wenner-Gren 2003 interview) reply to the question of the specific properties and foundations of the Manchester School: "Well, this identity, one can say, of Manchester [School] was basically connected with Gluckman and where Gluckman came from, which is Oxford and structural functionalism. And identity is also connected with politics, but it was a left-wing politics. And each of these movements had a little rebellion against it, and in its core were also people who weren't aware of Marxism and didn't know much about it."[24]

Therefore, while looking for common features, it is probably easier to identify a stock of common problems, a core of shared values, or even a specific lifestyle[25] than to depict a theoretical framework that might account for the strongly manifested solidarity of Mancunians. At the same time, the solidarity

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

itself seems to diversify the membership. The Africanists with RLI experiences have shown a stronger allegiance to the group than people who have worked elsewhere. Finally, then, while thinking about the Manchester School in a typological sense, labels such as 'Marxist' or 'non-Marxist' definitely are less important than the extent to which, and the way in which, those researchers tackled in their studies similar problems and applied the same research tool-kit to come up with sometimes similar answers. In the domain of methodology, it is especially the extended-case method, which evolved out of Gluckman's situational analysis, that reached the status of a yardstick.[26]

Max Gluckman, Manchester Seminars, and the Extended-Case Method

In view of what has been said so far, it is absolutely impossible to find a pattern or to chart the gradual development of the school without taking into account Max Gluckman and his personal leadership. It is also hard to sketch the portrait of the Manchester School without a mention of Gluckman's personal charisma. He attracted a strong personal loyalty but sometimes brought about the banishment of some 'people on the margins' to the outer perimeter of his circle of students and colleagues. As remembered by Bruce Kapferer (1987), a lecturer in the department in the 1960s, a gradually deepening status distance and differences of power between Gluckman and his followers might have led to the estrangement of younger colleagues.[27] Numerous forewords to the books of his students and colleagues expressed Gluckman's awareness of his influence in inspiring their research and writings while recognizing that their insights animated his own imagination. The consequences of such developments were described by Kapferer (1987: 3): "[T]hose who were not caught up in his enthusiasm, those whose ideas were not pushed as part of Gluckman's own intellectual development, often felt left out and expressed bitterness." Likewise, according to Shokeid (1992), Gluckman's energy, generosity, and parental power unsurprisingly led to competition for his attention and the resources under his control.

However, as I see it, his contribution to the emergence of the school in the institutional sense was much more important and exceeded his role in shaping the identities and feelings of belonging to the Gluckman-centered network. Schumaker's (2001) study gives a rich documentation of the expansion and achievements of the Central African research orchestrated by Gluckman. The famous "seven-year plan" (Gluckman 1945) launched at the RLI led to a unique, systematic regional research that in many ways changed how anthropology has been practiced since then. At the same time, although the success of Gluckman's African scheme was unprecedented, as Kapferer (1987: 5) put it: "African anthropology WAS anthropology." However, after the first decade of the RLI under Gluckman, only Colson and Mitchell continued to do Central African fieldwork. Despite Gluckman's vision of resuming the Central African research on its former scale, the earlier policy of concerted research failed to

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

be a viable option in the 1960s. Instead, Gluckman attempted to repeat within the Manchester Department the African team-research success story by initiating rural and industrial studies in Britain and by sparking a research scheme conducted in Israel. The scale of Gluckman's endeavors and his predilection for the coordinated character of research are revealed especially by his involvement in the Israeli Bernstein project, which occupied the major part of his time and efforts during the last 12 years of his life.

All of this suggests the relevance of a team-focused way of working in shaping the identity of Manchester anthropology. At the same time, Gluckman's conscious efforts to create a most favorable environment for organized research materialized in particular in the development of the famous seminars at Manchester, which derived from seminars and conferences held at the RLI headquarters. The enormous role played by these seminars in the consolidation and expansion of the school in a psychological sense is well documented. Both the Central African and Israeli research projects resulted in long lists of publications, the authors of which have in their works acknowledged Gluckman and fellow Mancunians, but often the departmental seminar itself, reflecting its unusually creative and integrative potential.[28] Gluckman (n.d.) has himself drawn a picture of the seminar in a suggestive way that evokes a notion of the "mythic charter" he needed to narrate the birth of the school (cf. Schumaker 2001: 253). Yet the persuasive nature of his description notwithstanding, this indicates as well that the seminar provided a forum where the Manchester School as a typologically separate intellectual formation was forged and renewed over time.

It is worthwhile to identify the scholars invited to take part in this intellectual endeavor in its initial phase to make clear that the seminar attracted not only anthropologists. Participants in the seminars in the 1950s were Oxbridge dons—M. Fortes and E.E. Evans-Pritchard, but also S. N. Eisenstadt, E. Goffman, G. C. Homans, T. Parsons, and E. Shils (some of whom were Simon Visiting Professors at Manchester). At the same time, the interdisciplinary character of the seminar was connected with the regular attendance of Manchester scholars from other fields, particularly philosopher Dorothy Emmet, economist Ely Devons, and political scientist W. J. M. Mackenzie. Gluckman's (1964) edited collection, *Closed Systems and Open Minds*, shows that such an association with representatives of other disciplines bore fruit, as far as a reflection on the conditions and determinants of anthropological knowledge is concerned. Gluckman and Devons discuss there the seminar papers of Turner, Bailey, Bill Epstein, Lupton, Sheila Cunnison, and Watson to come up with conclusions about the basic procedures by which fields of study in anthropology are demarcated.

In fact, the topics discussed in the volume—the reduction of internal complexity of reality under study, the circumscription of a field of research and analysis, the legitimate use of the findings of other disciplines in anthropological studies—reflected the dominant and enduring motifs of the research seminars at Manchester, though articulated in a more abstract way. No doubt, in many respects the Manchester seminars resembled the RLI ones. They were mainly devoted to presentations of field material or reanalyses of classic ethnographies,

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

thus confirming that, in general, theory as such was not a subject of inquiry. As Bailey (Wenner-Gren 2003 interview) recalls such occasions: "They always began with a case or with a piece of fieldwork, and an argument developed from that. And the theoretical things [then] came out of that. This wasn't a straight discussion about what theory is, [though you could say that] we had theoretical discussions. They arose in the context of particular events that were recorded in Central Africa or India, or whatever else it was. So we were to some extent theoretical."[29]

There is little doubt that the researchers trained by Gluckman and his followers tended to approach social reality with a viewpoint different from the position of pre-war structural-functional anthropology. In principle, however, in Bailey's opinion,[30] it was due not to a body of theory but rather to a common, unified methodology that one can regard the Manchester anthropology as a 'school' in the most taxing, typological sense. This is not to say that it is impossible to identify the basic theoretical themes running through the writings of Mancunians,[31] yet the focus was principally on discussing research findings and teaching and modifying field methods through the collective efforts of the seminars' participants. Nevertheless, at the same time one can claim that the advancements in methods were channeled through a distinctive theoretical stance typical of Mancunian anthropology. This is why in what follows I try to cast some light on the theoretical underpinnings of the most important innovation in anthropological inquiry attributed to the Manchester School, namely, the extended-case method.

The best way to explore these supposed links between theory and method is to look at an important article, first published in 1940 in the *Journal of Bantu Studies,* resulting from Gluckman's early fieldwork in Zululand. Titled "Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand," and popularly known as "The Bridge," the article deals with the events surrounding the ceremonial opening of the first bridge in Zululand built under the new schemes of local development. It contains a thorough description of "several events which were linked by [Gluckman's] presence as an observer, but which occurred in different parts of Northern Zululand and involved different groups of people" (Gluckman [1940] 1958: 8–9). It is disputable whether or not the method portrayed in "The Bridge" was already that of an extended case. For example, individual actions were regarded as important in the context of macro processes with some neglect for the problem of individuals choosing between one set of structural norms and another (cf. Frankenberg 1982; Werbner [1984] 1990). Nevertheless, Gluckman's detailed analysis meant a sea change in the mode of presenting ethnographic material.

As to its theoretical ramifications, Gluckman's approach implies that the complex events he refers to as "social situations," within which the actions of individuals and groups involved take place, are seen as the reflection of the complexity of social structure. In contrast to Bronisław Malinowski's theory of culture contact, Gluckman describes Africans and Europeans in their various social roles, directed by different motives and interests, as symbolically and structurally divided but intimately interrelated in a single social system. But his

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

analysis of the situation in Zululand raised further theoretical issues—the problem of the achievement of equilibrium in the system, which due to instability of the situation requires accommodation of conflicts; the issue of the relationship between structural constraints and individual choice within the unstable systems; the issue of how macro processes are reflected in individual actions and produce in turn "standardized but unplanned relationships and associations." For Gluckman's followers, this was the extended-case method, which promised to cope with all of the weak points of structural-functional approaches.

As Gluckman ([1940] 1958: 2) himself put it: "[S]ocial situations are a large part of the raw material of the anthropologist. They are events he observes, and from them and their interrelationships in a particular society he abstracts the social structure, relationships, institutions, etc., of that society. By them, and by new situations, he must check the validity of his generalizations." This approach also related to the question as to what form the field material should be in when presented to the reader. Instead of presenting tidy abstractions and inferences from the field material, the anthropologist would provide the reader with some of the material itself. Needless to say, the researcher who presented extended cases had less leeway to shape or even disfigure the data.

Later, such a way of presenting and dealing with ethnographic data was called "situational analysis" (van Velsen 1967) and meant the analysis of the case "as a stage in an on-going process of social relations between specific persons and groups in a social system and culture" (Gluckman 1967: xv). In addition, an adopted situational frame of reference differed from Oxford-style structural-functionalist description in supplementing the analysis of the static of the structure with an account of the actions showing how individuals in particular structural positions cope with the complicated choices they face. Consequently, one can claim that by means of the integration of case material, situational analysis seeks to integrate variations, exceptions from structural regularities, and accidents into descriptions of regularities. All this indicates that dissatisfaction with conventional modes of presenting ethnographic material in which extended-case analysis was grounded spurred Gluckman to envision theoretical reformulations and methodological innovations.

Finally, when looking for the tenets of the Manchester School, it seems to be the gradual development of the extended-case method that represents an enduring thread linking together the modes of methodological training and theoretical inquiries imposed at the different stages of the institutional growth of the school. The constitution of the school seen in this way indicates the significance of the method itself imparted by Gluckman to his followers and students during frequent and intense exchanges at the seminars run at the RLI and later in Manchester. This is proven by the observations of historians of anthropology that the RLI research officers on their arrival in 1946 were familiarized with "The Bridge," which was thoroughly discussed at the institute. For example, Schumaker (2001: 78) quotes in this respect Ian Cunnison's remark: "The Bridge, the Bridge, all the time the first few years." The results of this kind of training are especially vividly noticeable in the manner of presenting material and its analysis employed by Mitchell (1956) in his early monograph

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

The Kalela Dance. While trying to emulate the same method as Gluckman, Mitchell starts with a description of the dance itself and then relates its basic features to the system of relationships within the social setting under study. However, in order to do this, he had to take into consideration the whole system of black-white relationships in Northern Rhodesia. As he put it: "[B]y working outwards from a specific social situation ... the whole social fabric of the Territory is therefore taken in" (Mitchell 1956: 1). In other words, only by tracing particular elements of social events back into the society at large is the researcher able to demonstrate their significance to the social life.

Several accounts of different scenes at the Manchester seminars that reveal the theoretical significance of the extended-case method and the nature of its formative quality are available in the anthropological literature. One remarkable scene, pictured by Edith Turner (1985: 5), describes a seminar in which her husband Victor Turner presented for the first time his application of the extended-case method to his Ndembu ethnography: "With controlled excitement he read the story of Sandombu; and he analyzed its stages—breach, crisis, redress, reintegration—the social drama as the window into Ndembu social organization and values. Now you see the living heart. Max sat, his hands folded on top of his bowed bald head. When it was over, he raised his head, his eyes burning. 'You've got it! That's it.'"

The type of analysis of social situations worked out by Turner is documented later in his *Schism and Continuity in an African Society* (1957) and confirms that the Manchester anthropology had its own distinctive way of exploring social action and change. In addition, situational analysis gave rise to the transformation of the very category of 'social situation' into concepts of 'social drama', 'social field', and 'arena', which, for instance, became key categories of the processual paradigm in political anthropology (cf. Vincent 1990: 337ff.). In this context, the issue of theoretical advancement returns. I think it is not an exaggeration to claim that it was due to the methodologies of situational analysis, extended cases, and 'social dramas' that the Manchester approach to social structure and social change was innovative. As Don Handelman (1987: 73) makes it clear, these methodologies have enabled Mancunians to produce new sorts of data, which can described as interactional, and demonstrate the complex interplay between social relationships and the choices of individuals, between institutions and customs. Handelman regards such a view on the relationships between macro and micro order as the essence of the anti-reductionist position of the Manchester School. Accordingly, although Mancunian studies remain structural analyses, they have always tried to interpret the observed reality by introducing another important dimension, that is, an analysis of social interaction and the complexities of social process. At the same time, the Manchester anthropology has also implied the recognition of the complexity of the real social world as being constituted in the day-to-day mundane living of ordinary people.

As a result, many of the theoretical issues discussed during the Manchester seminars of the 1950s and 1960s anticipated much of what Anthony Giddens and Pierre Bourdieu would later write about structure and agency. Instead of

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

monostructural models of social reality, the seminar participants wanted to understand structures in action. Bailey (Wenner-Gren 2003 interview) assesses the situation that was typical by the early 1950s: "The general idea was there, certainly. It came to us not as 'agency' but as 'action theory,' which is the notion that people take initiatives, do things that have effects on the structure. We believed it was necessary to recognize the complexity of the real world. When you look at *The Nuer*, it is so easy to read, so beautiful, because vast amounts of material have been put on one side. So many questions are not asked or [are] simply left unanswered in the interest of simplifying everything down to a single pattern that explains everything. That was not the Manchester way."

From Gluckman's point of view, the school's development was a basic product of the improvement of extended-case study methods, which led to greater interest in the complexity of "each unique period and parcel of history; in the life-histories and lives of individuals; in the choices that individuals have available to manipulate to their advantage" (Gluckman 1968: 234). He was also quite frank in pointing out an inexorable dilemma that the anthropologist has to cope with—when one reduces the complexities of data in the structural analysis of interaction patterns, one loses much of the process of actual social life. Finally, then, it turns out that in contrast to a 'structural-functional study', the critical point for the Manchester school was a concern for the immediacy of everyday social life and real-world agency. In effect, the search for the logic of stability that was typical of structural functionalism was supplanted within this school by an attempt to describe the alternative courses of action that are available and to understand the logic of praxis. No doubt, this approach came about for methodological reasons in order to avoid the loss of the uniqueness and richness of the ethnographic data.

Conclusions

To sum up, the RLI and the Department of Social Anthropology and Sociology in Manchester under Max Gluckman for many years included a core group of Mancunians and many people more loosely connected with the center who influenced each other by sharp, at times harsh, criticism in and out seminars, by working together, and by spending time together away from work. The ethnographies produced from the seminars organized by Gluckman arguably are among the most outstanding written by anthropologists at that time. Their authors (Barnes, Bailey, Colson, the Cunnisons, the Epsteins, Frankenberg, Marwick, Mitchell, Turner, van Velsen, Watson, and Gluckman himself) established new standards and patterns of anthropological field research and analysis. These developments have in turn made possible a sort of empirical rediscovery and conceptual replication of Gluckman's findings, thanks to the shared sophisticated methods of gathering data during fieldwork. Thus, while considering the Manchester School in a strict sense of the term—that is, the typological sense—the emphasis must be placed on the extended-case method.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Its development gradually constitutes a theoretically laden framework, set also in general terms, that in particular aims at analyzing the interrelation of the structural regularities and the actual behavior of individuals that petrifies social life as much as generating its constant change. In other words, it is the tight integration of methods and theorizing that determines the exceptionality of the Manchester School.[32] One can argue that the Mancunians were united by a near homology of methods and theory, and for this reason, despite the apparent lack of high-flying theorizing among most of them, the Mancunian anthropology remains a distinctive school of thought of a weight hardly to be surpassed by other currents in social or cultural anthropology.

Acknowledgments

As this essay is partially based on oral history and archival work, as well as formal and informal interviews with the members and associates of the former Department of Social Anthropology and Sociology of the Victoria University at Manchester, my thanks are due to many people and institutions. I owe a great debt to all Mancunians for their time and their encouragement. Several foundations provided financial support for my research: the Fulbright Commission of the US Government, the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, the British Academy, and the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.

Marian Kempny (1954–2006) was Professor of Sociology at Warsaw University and also served as Head of the Culture Theory Unit at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, the Polish Academy of Sciences. He had done field research in Cieszyn Silesia and was a member of a group of scholars who reintroduced the works of Malinowski to Polish social science. Kempny had a number of books to his credit. Two of these, for which he served as co-editor, appeared in English: *Cultural Dilemmas of Post-Communist Societies* (1994) and *Identity in Transformation: Postmodernity, Postcommunism, and Globalization* (2002). Much of his work was devoted to the study of anthropological knowledge, social theory, and cultural analysis.

Notes

1. See, for instance, Kuper (1983: 128ff.) and Vincent (1990: 276ff.), or Barnard (2000: 84ff.) for a more recent work. The most extensive account of the Manchester School in terms of its theoretical content has been provided by Werbner ([1984] 1990).
2. This document (Gluckman n.d.) was written around 1962.
3. This point is made, for instance, by Moshe Shokeid (1988–1989). However, one can try to give an explanation for this by examining the intellectual lineages of leading anthropologists in America, as in the case of the Comaroffs and Victor Turner, an intermediary of the Mancunian tradition.
4. One can even reasonably argue whether there was any theory developed there at all. Such an opinion was expressed by Fred Bailey in February 2003 in an interview

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

recorded by myself for the Wenner-Gren Anthropological Archives program. At the same time, Werbner ([1984] 1990) who discusses various strands of the Manchester tradition, concludes that although the Manchester School now has no overriding theoretical focus, the distinctive approaches that the school developed have not ceased to be of theoretical interest.

5. Gluckman (n.d.) himself discloses that many theoretical innovations of the school have had their roots elsewhere: "I stress again that though we did work closely together, we never failed to consult the work of others on the same problems, as a reference to any of our books will show. I myself used American sociological jurisprudence in my book on *The Judicial Process Among the Barotse* (1955), as did A.L. Epstein [1953] in his studies [of urban courts]; Mitchell brought reference-group theory from American sociology into British anthropology (*The Kalela Dance*, 1956); Watson himself used for his book on labour migration not only our own research, but also work by South African anthropologists, and by economic historians on the same situation in Britain. And so forth."
6. The Manchester School also included later anthropological studies in Israel under the umbrella of the 'Bernstein project', starting in 1963 (see Marx 1980).
7. What is noteworthy, it is quite likely that Gluckman himself used the term 'sociology' more often than 'anthropology' in order to describe the kind of research he had in mind while focused on the issue of how systems with important racial conflicts and cleavages could manage to function (cf. Schumaker 2001: 34).
8. Gluckman (n.d.) writes about this group as the "first-class people: Elizabeth Colson (now Professor of Anthropology at Brandeis University), J. A. Barnes (now Professor of Anthropology at the Australian National University), J. H. Holleman (now Director of the Social Studies Research Unit at the University of Natal), and J. C. Mitchell (now Professor of African Studies at the University College of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland)."
9. In Gluckman's unpublished document, the outcome of 30 books and "booklets" and numerous articles is mentioned.
10. The gradual weakening of the institutional ties with the RLI might be perceived as a major blow to the Manchester School. Bruce Kapferer has implied that the virtual dying away of the creative fieldwork connection between the Mancunian and Central African research brought about Gluckman's efforts to repeat the African model with a program of concerted research in Israel (the so-called Bernstein project). See Olaf Smedal's interview with Kapferer (http://www.anthrobase.com/Txt/S/Smedal_Kapferer_01.htm).
11. Mitchell is especially outspoken in this respect: "The Manchester School was not a school but a set of research studies based on basic procedures" (quoted in Schumaker 2001: 107).
12. Such a claim is overtly made by van Velsen (1967: 139), who links the methodological developments of Mancunians with "the reaction to structuralism [i.e., to structural functionalism] as formulated by Radcliffe-Brown and developed by some of his students."
13. Cf. Schumaker (2001: 151), who refers to Gluckman's 1949 letter to Clyde Mitchell.
14. As Bailey commented upon it (Wenner-Gren 2003 interview): "This left Max—I think—very, very, not exactly troubled, but uncertain because he had a huge respect and affection for Radcliffe-Brown and Evans-Pritchard and—I think—a part of it was a rebellion against this on our part. Because their theory was too remote from the empirical facts that we were talking about, we were describing. It didn't explain things, except obvious things that everybody knows, very clear, it didn't explain change directly. I mean, we need to know what the structural things do, we need the framework to talk about change, about the process of change, but it wasn't enough, of course."
15. Schumaker (2001) mentions, for example, radio talks given by the team that were organized by Gluckman to popularize their research.
16. As Gluckman (n.d.) described it: "[I]n the early 1960s a Central African program restarted with Garbett holding a Fellowship of the International African Institute at Salisbury and with two Manchester students (Werbner and Lang) gone to Salisbury to do their fieldwork for the PhD with Mitchell." Mitchell resigned from the RLI directorship

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

in 1966 to take up Gluckman's offer of a professorship at Manchester, a move that in the end undermined the Central African program.

17. The inscription in Mitchell (1969) reads: "To Max Gluckman, point-source of our network."
18. As Bailey explains (Wenner-Gren 2003 interview): "I put myself in that one—I went to India, and Scarlett Epstein was one, she went to India too. There were others whom you might not know. There was a guy called Allcorn, who worked in London on teenage youth, Emrys [Peters] of course, it's another part of Africa ... And there is a generation that ... still, kind of, adheres to one another of this group. You know these Israelis, the other one I can think about was [Bruce] Kapferer who came late via RLI and Mitchell. I wonder even whether he did his PhD in Manchester. I know that his book is very heavily influenced by Mitchell and Manchester."
19. As Gluckman (n.d.) explains: "I had myself to take on the teaching of sociological theory, and instead of getting a Senior Lecturer in Sociology, we appointed as Lecturer, W. Watson, who before studying two tribes in Northern Rhodesia for the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, had carried out research in Scotland. Out of this work, Watson developed a view of patterns of social mobility, for the study of which in the Lancashire town of Leigh, we got a grant from the Nuffield Foundation."
20. Frankenberg's case is telling example here. Instead of African fieldwork, he started research on rural problems at Manchester and in 1957 published a book, *Village on the Border*, praised by Gluckman as an excellent anthropological study. But it emerged out of necessity when Frankenberg was caught by surprise by deportation from a West Indian island where he had intended to do his fieldwork (Frankenberg [1957] 1989: 171ff.).
21. Gluckman himself modified his initial position on the nature of social systems and social change to accentuate that such mechanisms as 'the peace in the feud' or 'rituals of rebellion' express the dialectic between cohesion and conflict, which stimulate the political activity of main actors within the system (Gluckman 1963).
22. Their South African background is often given as an explanation (Kuper 1983: 144; Schumaker 2001: 109–110).
23. Paradoxically, Mancunian anthropology is also accused of being a 'colonial science'. See van Teeffelen (1977, 1978) and Shokeid's (1988–1989) rejoinder.
24. His view is shared by Bruce Kapferer (2000), who holds: "Many were members of the Communist Party (though Gluckman was not, rather his wife, Mary; Gluckman was merely sympathetic) such as Bill Epstein, Bill Watson. Vic Turner, before he turned Catholic, was one of the intellectual spokesmen for the British Communist Party. But many, such as Clyde Mitchell, were more liberal in their politics."
25. It is reflected in their labeling as 'the cloth-cap boys', which underlines the contrast between their social position and that of upper-middle-class Oxbridge. Additionally, their passion for football, which went hand in hand with an allegiance to Manchester United, Gluckman's favorite football team, was an indicator of the strong working-class affiliations of Mancunians (Fred Bailey and Mike Aronoff, personal communications with author).
26. The exclusively Mancunian methodological handbook, *The Craft of Social Anthropology*, edited by Bill Epstein (1967), is an example of the product of the core group with Central African experience.
27. In comparison with the first generation of Mancunians, Gluckman's students later became considerably younger and more career dependent. In addition, Gluckman was less directly involved in their projects, with senior colleagues serving as academic intermediaries (see Shokeid 1992).
28. Furthermore, sometimes words of appreciation appeared in books written by scholars from outside Manchester whose works were discussed within the seminar. Compare such acknowledgments in Elisabeth Bott's (1957) *Family and Social Network*, and in Eric Hobsbawm's ([1959] 1965) *Primitive Rebels*.
29. Shokeid (1992: 235) mentions in this context the "shock treatment" he experienced when he transferred from the grand theory of Eisenstadt's Sociology Department at

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Hebrew University, Jerusalem, to the Manchester Department, with its seminars focused on reporting simple facts and minute observations.

30. As Bailey recalls it (Wenner-Gren 2003 interview), there was no "body of theory akin to what, for instance, makes 'Durkheim and his young men' a distinctive school. At the time I was there I don't think that had begun to develop. We didn't have a clear position on the map of grand theory in sociology."
31. See especially the insightful essays by Handelman (1976) and Werbner ([1984] 1990).
32. I would like to credit Don Handelman with making this point clear to me in his editorial remarks on a draft version of this essay.

References

Balandier, G. 1960. "Structures sociales traditionelles et changements economiques." *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines* 1, no. 1: 1–14.

Barnard, A. 2000. *History and Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bott, E. 1957. *Family and Social Network: Roles, Norms and External Relationships in Ordinary Urban Families*. London: Tavistock.

Colson, E., and M. Gluckman, eds. 1951. *Seven Tribes of British Central Africa*. London: Oxford University Press for the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute.

Douglas, M. 1959. "Review: W. Watson, *Tribal Cohesion in a Money Economy*." *Man* 59, no. 270: 168.

Epstein, A. L. 1953. "The Role of African Courts in Urban Communities of the Northern Rhodesian Copperbelt." *Rhodes-Livingstone Journal* 13: 1–26.

______, ed. 1967. *The Craft of Social Anthropology*. London: Social Science Paperbacks in association with Tavistock Publications.

Frankenberg, R. [1957] 1989. *Village on the Border.* Manchester: Manchester University Press. (Reprinted: Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.)

______. 1982. "Introduction: A Social Anthropology for Britain?" Pp. 1–35 in *Custom and Conflict in British Society*, ed. R. Frankenberg. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Gluckman, M. [1940] 1958. "Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand." *Journal of Bantu Studies* 14: 1–30, 147–174. (Reprinted as Rhodes-Livingstone Papers, no. 28, by Manchester University Press for the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute.)

______. 1945. "The Seven-Year Research Plan of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute." *Journal of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute* 4: 1–32.

______. 1955. *The Judicial Process Among the Barotse of Northern Rhodesia*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

______. 1963. *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

______. 1967. "Introduction." Pp. xi–xx in Epstein 1967.

______, ed. 1964. *Closed Systems and Open Minds*. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd.

______. 1968. "The Utility of the Equilibrium Model in the Study of Social Change. *American Anthropologist* 70, no. 2: 219–237.

______. n.d. "The History of the Manchester 'School' of Social Anthropology and Sociology." Unpublished manuscript.

Handelman, D. 1976. "Some Contributions of Max Gluckman to Anthropological Thought." Pp. 7–14 in *Freedom and Constraint: A Memorial Tribute to Max Gluckman*, ed. Myron J. Aronoff. Assen: Van Gorcum.

______. 1987. "Micro-Structure and Micro-Process." *Social Analysis* 22: 73–102.

Hobsbawm, E. J. [1959] 1965. *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th Century*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Kapferer, B. 1987. "The Anthropology of Max Gluckman." *Social Analysis* 22: 3–21.

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

______. 2000. "An Interview." *Antropolog Nytt* 3. http://www.anthrobase.com/txt/S/Smedal_Kapferer_01.htm.

Kuper, A. 1983. *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Marx, E. 1980. "Introduction." Pp. 1–14 in *A Composite Portrait of Israel*, ed. E. Marx. London and New York: Academic Press.

Mitchell, J. C. 1956. *The Kalela Dance*. Rhodes-Livingstone Papers, no. 27. Manchester: Manchester University Press for the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute.

______, ed. 1969. *Social Networks in Urban Situations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mitchell, J. C., and J. A. Barnes. 1950. *The Lamba Village: Report of a Social Survey*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Schumaker, L. 2001. *Africanizing Anthropology: Fieldwork, Networks, and the Making of Cultural Knowledge in Central Africa*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Shokeid, M. 1988–1989. "'The Manchester School in Africa and Israel' Revisited: Reflections on the Sources and Method of an Anthropological Discourse." *Israel Social Science Research* 6, no. 1: 9–23.

______. 1992. "An Anthropologist's Work between Moving Genres." *Ethnos* 57, no. 3-4: 234–244.

Szacki, J. 1975. "'Schools' in Sociology." *Social Science Information* 14, no. 2: 173–182.

Turner, E. 1985. "Prologue: From the Ndembu to Broadway." Pp. 1–15 in *On the Edge of the Bush: Anthropology as Experience*, ed. E. Turner. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Turner, V. W. 1957. *Schism and Continuity in an African Society*. Manchester: Manchester University Press for the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute.

Van Teeffelen, T. 1977. *Anthropologists on Israel: A Case Study in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Amsterdam: Antropologisch-Sociologisch Centrum, University of Amsterdam, Papers on European and Mediterranean Societies.

______. 1978. "The Manchester School in Africa and Israel: A Critique." *Dialectical Anthropology* 3: 67–83.

Van Velsen, J. 1967. "The Extended-Case Method and Situational Analysis." Pp. 129–149 in Epstein 1967.

Vincent, J. 1990. *Anthropology and Politics*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Watson, W. 1958. *Tribal Cohesion in a Money Economy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Werbner, R. P. [1984] 1990. "The Manchester School in South-Central Africa." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 13: 157–185. (Revised version in *Localizing Strategies: Regional Traditions of Ethnographic Writing*, ed. R. Fardon. Edinburgh and Washington: Scottish Academic Press and Smithsonian Institution Press.)

This content downloaded from 195.78.109.54 on Sat, 14 Jun 2014 02:44:34 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions